

Part 2, Was there a conspiracy?

CBS: "The Commission has found no evidence that either Lee Harvey Oswald or Jack Ruby was part of any conspiracy....' And the report also states: 'The Commission has found no evidence that anyone assisted Oswald in planning out the assassination.'... contrary to the popular impression, the Commission, by these words, left the door open on the question of conspiracy just a crack...They don't say that the Commission concluded that there was no conspiracy or that Oswald was the sole assassin..."(page 1)

Fact: This was a good point, if CBS had honest intent, to tell its listeners that the Report was designed to give something quotable on almost anything. However, they didn't, and they chose to ignore the very unequivocal statement of just the opposite in the Commission chapter entitled "Summary and Conclusions". There (page 19) under "Conclusions", this is the fourth: "The shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally were fired by Lee Harvey Oswald. This conclusion is based upon the following:" There follow the Commission's seven reasons for concluding Oswald was the lone assassin. Identically the same is true of the Tippit murder. This is the Commission's fifth conclusion, on the very next page. Here the Report repeats that this conclusion also "upholds the finding that Oswald fired the shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally".

Here CBS lied, not by accident. The Report does conclude exactly the opposite of CBS' misrepresentation of it. It does not "only say that the Commission could find no evidence that others were involved, no evidence that there was a conspiracy";

Part 2, page 2

it straightforwardly says that Oswald was the lone and un-assisted assassin and murderer of the policeman. At the time of these broadcasts, this lie is no accident, for there was then a concentration of apologies for the government's error, all of which emphasized this same lie, particularly the Associated Press series by Gavzer and Moody.

CBS: "If there was a conspiracy, it could have taken one of two forms: either Oswald was a sole triggerman for behind-the-scenes manipulators or there were one or more additional gunmen firing at the President". (page 2)

Fact: The most obvious conspiracy is one not involving Oswald, as assassin, which CBS does not mention. ~~It~~ In any event, ^{this} is a third possibility and makes another and again a not accidental lie of the CBS statement a conspiracy "could have taken one of two forms", each including Oswald as assassin.

CBS: "The single-bullet theory has become perhaps the most controversial aspect of the report...The Commission said it was not essential to its conclusions" (page 2).

Fact: It is not the single-bullet theory that the Commission said was not essential to its conclusions, for it is, and C.B.S.' own ~~xxxxxxxx~~ position and shows cannot survive admission of it. The Commission accounted for three shots: one that inflicted seven non-fatal injuries on both men; the fatal shot, that it said exploded and left fragments inside the car and that damaged the car in two minor places; and one that missed entirely, that J. Edgar Hoover said could not be associated with

any bullet or fragment of bullet that struck the car or any of its occupants. This misrepresentation lays the foundation for the repetition of a lie by Arlen Specter, the man credited with fatherhood of the single-bullet theory, which is in the fourth program (on pages 5-6). What the Commission said "is not necessary to any essential findings of the Commission" is "to determine just which shot hit Governor Connally" (Report 19). This also is quite false, for the fatal shot is eliminated and the Commission says the non-fatal shot hit the President between Frames 210 and 225 of the Zapruder film. Governor Connally was never in a position to have a single bullet inflict all the damage on him after about Frame 240, or never when there was time for the firing of it. There likewise is no doubt of the missed shot, for it wounded a bystander, James C. Tague. CBS had to avoid this false statement in the Report. To do otherwise was self-destructive.

CBS: In the same paragraph CBS proves it lied, concluding it this way: "...either three groups of wounds were caused by two bullets, which is the single bullet theory, or all three bullets fired from Oswald's rifle struck President Kennedy and Governor Connally, which the Commission rejected in the belief that one bullet missed completely" (page 2).

Fact: There were not three groups of wounds caused by two bullets, and this is not the single-bullet theory. That theory is correctly stated above. There were four groups of wounds. One, in the President's head, by the so-called "fatal" bullet, and the pair of wounds in the President's neck, the wounds in the

governor's chest, wrist and thigh, all/^{allegedly} caused by the "single bullet".

CBS: "This photograph (Dillard's, of the Negroes in the fifth-floor windows), taken only seconds after the assassination..."(page 2)

Fact: Seconds is an abbreviation. CBS suppressed knowledge of the Hughes film or, what is more complimentary, was ignorant of it. This motion picture, which shows, in the same picture, both the entire south face of the TSBD and the motorcade on Elm Street, taken at the moment of the assassination, disproves the Commission story and the account of the testimony of these three men that CBS here uses, on the next page. (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 125-30, 278-80)

CBS: Holland's "is perhaps the most telling account in favor of the grassy knoll theory" (page 3).

Fact: The more accurate formulation is not "grassy-knoll theory" but ~~not~~ "shot from the right front" which includes the grassy knoll. And "the most telling" evidence is not eye-witness testimony, important as that is, but the tangible evidence. The doctors and nurses who initially saw the President -- the only ones who ever saw the wound in the front of the President's neck -- then said it was or appeared to be an entrance wound. Such a statement was still in the autopsy report two days after the assassination and was confirmed to the autopsy doctors the day after the assassination by Dr. Perry (WHITEWASH 169-70, 180, 183-4, 198). CBS simply ignored this tangible proof of a shot from the front.

Part 2, Page 5

CBS: "Mr. Zapruder, when we interviewed him here, tended to agree that the knoll was not involved." Here Zapruder is interviewed. He says, "...I believe that if there were shots that came from my right ear, I would hear a different sound. I heard the shots coming from -- I wouldn't know which direction to say -- but they was driven from the Texas Book Depository and they all sounded alike..."(page 4)

Fact: Zapruder immediately told the Secret Service that the shots had come from his right, from the grassy knoll (NEWARK PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 15, 138-9). He also indicated this at the beginning of his testimony, when the brainwashing had not been completed.

CBS: Used James W. Altgens to say "...at the time he (JFK) was struck by this blow to the head, it was so obvious that it came from behind. It had to come from behind because it caused him to bolt forward..."

Fact: CBS edited Altgens, for he told the FBI (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 70 and 203) and testified before the Commission that the exploded brain matter and other tissue splashed to the left, not consistent with the official account of damage to the right side of the President's head only. More important, CBS used what it knew to be an incorrect recollection, for it knew the Zapruder pictures show that the President never "bolted", never went forward. It knew also that the President moved first backward, and then to his left, which is exactly what the Zapruder film, incontrovertible evidence shows. On the next page, CBS did admit this is in a different context (page 5)

CBS: "OFFICER JACKS: The car in which I was driving, which occupied the Vice President, was -- had just completed its turn, and I felt a blast which appeared to be a rifle shot come from behind me. I turned and looked up at the School Book Depository."

There could have been no shots from in front, Jacks is led to say, and "I could feel the concussion from all three" (Page 5).

Facts: Assuming what is improbable, that Jacks felt the concussion of all three shots --and by the third was well down Elm Street and away from the Depository Building -- he did not and could not have felt the first "from behind me" if it came from that sixth floor window. The incontrovertible evidence of the Altgens pictures proves this. By the time of the Altgens picture, Frame 255, Jacks' car, the third, was opposite the second of the road-lane stripes (WHITEWASH 202-3; WHITEWASH II 244-5). This stripe is roughly parallel with the main entrance to the building (WHITEWASH 209, WHITEWASH II 246). If the President had not been struck before Frame 210, as without doubt he had been, as I proved -- and CBS also says -- at that part of the Zapruder film Jacks could not have completed his turn and any concussion he felt from behind him and to his right would have had to come from elsewhere, could not have come from the TSBD.

CBS: "In Abraham Zapruder's film of the assassination, the fatal shot appears to move the head back. The critics contend this can only mean the shot came not from the Book Depository, but from somewhere in front. Not for the first time, nor for the last in these reports, we find equally qualified experts in disagree--

ment. We put the question of the President's head movement to an experienced photo analyst and two expert pathologists" (page 6)

Fact: It is true that some of the critics now contend that the Zapruder film shows the President's head moving backward. However, I know of no book by any critic save my own WHITEWASH II which so states.

The first of the experts CBS here presents is Charles Wyckoff. He is not asked about and he makes no reference to the backward motion of the President's head. This is what CBS said they put to him. They did not. Dan Rather said, "...the explosion... occurs forward of the President. Now, wouldn't that indicate the bullet coming from the front?" To this Wyckoff disagreed (page 6). Rather then engaged in a large misrepresentation, of the critics and of CBS' own statement of what the critics hold: "well, you're aware that some critics say that by the very fact that in the picture you can clearly see the explosion of the bullet on the front side of the President, that that certainly indicates the bullet came from the front" (page 7).

Perhaps CBS dredged up some criticism that it felt it could torture into "some critics say", but it knew and the only book says that the President's head moved backward, not forward, and this argument is based not on the explosion but on the incontrovertible head motion. However, Wyckoff's answer is slight comfort to the defenders of the Commission, though presented this way by CBS. Wyckoff showed a series of millionth-of-a-second pictures of a bullet going through a light bulb, with the "explosion" ahead of it. There is a vacuum inside a light bulb,

not brains, blood, bone, etc. But in any event, it is not "very similar to the Zapruder-Kennedy assassination films", as Wyckoff says, for in this case, from the Commission's story, only the right side of the head exploded, the explosion was to the front, and the splash and splatter, according to the witnesses and other evidence, was to the left. All of this was summed up by Cronkite in this towering non-sequitur: "That is one explanation from a physicist as to how a head could move backward after being struck from behind", followed by an understatement of similar magnitude, "which seems to many laymen not possible". I re-emphasize, Wyckoff made no reference to head direction.

There would be less question of CBS' integrity, less certainty of its partiality and intent, if it had not suppressed the fact that in publishing the individual frames of the Zapruder film the Commission had not reversed Frames 314 and 315 (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 25, 145), making the motion of the President's head in response to the strike in Frame 313 seem to be forward, exactly opposite to the backward direction than it really went, and had it not also suppressed the fact that there were nine unpublished frames (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 22, 144). The suppression of this unquestionable evidence -- the alternative is CBS ignorance, hardly possible with minimum journalistic and research competence, the investment of a half-million dollars, and a tremendous total of man-hours over a seven-month period -- is in itself proof that CBS never intended a fair both-sides presentation but designed the ex parte whitewash it presented

CBS: What must have been a much longer interview with Dr. Cyril W.

Part 2, Page 9

Wecht, a forensic pathologist, of Duquesne University, is contracted into a single short paragraph (page 7).

Fact: The essence is that it is "quite unlikely" that a shot from behind moved the head backward.

CBS: Here CBS produces the first of two "first appearances" since the assassination by two central doctors, ~~xxxxx~~ untroubled by the wonder why these doctors, both of whom are under attack, would appear for CBS and not for anyone else. The explanation is obvious: CBS promised a whitewash and that is what it delivered, aided immeasurably the the doctors who, in turn, were assisted by the CBS failure to ask the obvious questions, none of which they had to work hard to conceive, for they are set forth in my published work and some by others. First is Dr. Malcolm Perry, making "his first public statement since the report was published" (page 7).

Of the wound "in the front of the President's neck", of which Rather asked, Perry said his was "a very cursory examination" because of the need for "immediate action" (page 8) which is true but no answer, for to an experienced man a cursory examination is enough and Dr. Perry himself operated on that very point, hence examined it carefully. Asked, "Would you discuss" the front-wound "with me", Perry said what is entirely unrelated, that "the determination of entrance or exit frequently requires the ascertainment(sic) of trajectory. And this, of course, I did not do. None of us did at the time. There was no time for such things". This he followed with further evasion and falsehood, a paragraph on the difference in size between entrance and exit

wounds (with no reference to the specifics in this case), and the statement that with an undeformed military bullet, "the caliber of the bullet on entrance and exit will frequently be the same" and the wounds "would be very similar" (page 7).

Fact: This could be true of diameter but not character, as all the experts, without exception, acknowledged. The direction of the bullet is indicated by the intrusion or extrusion of the pieces of flesh. Entry wounds of non-tumbling bullets (this case) are smaller, the opposite of what CBS, the Report, and in this case Perry, say. See below.

CBS: "Did it occur to you at the time, or did you think, was this an entry wound, or was it an exit wound?" (page 8).

"I didn't give it much thought", Perry replied (no answer), going immediately into a restatement that he had to apply his energies to "the problem at hand", as did the others present, "and I really didn't concern myself too much with how it happened, or why". This paragraph, with a number of other similar evasions, lies and non-sequiturs, ends, "I didn't think much about it" (page 8)

Fact: The very first day, Perry said this was a wound of entrance. Virtually all the medical people at Parkland said this, some maintaining it even after considerable official pressure was applied. The second day Perry said the same thing, and it remained in the autopsy report for two days, when it was mysteriously removed without any alteration in the copy (WHITENASH 198). The sworn testimony is that when he learned this was inconsistent

Part 2, Page 11

with what the autopsy doctors were going to report, he asked Dr. Kemp Clark to take over his next press conference for him and he then fled Dallas, seeking to avoid all contact with the press. He would never have dared lay himself so wide open as on this CBS film without assurance he was going to be handled easily. CBS did not pin him down, did not ask him if on the second day he told Dr. Humes there was a front-entrance neck wound. Honesty required this.

CBS: "The nature of the throat wound can no longer be verified, for no records were made and no pictures taken before Dr. Perry cut through it in an attempt to relieve his patient's breathing" (page 8)

FACT: Records were made and recorded and exist, and they say the President was shot from the front. CBS lied. "The nature of the throat wound" can be "verified" and has been, by those who saw it. It is not true that because "no pictures were taken before Dr. Perry cut through it" the autopsy pictures could have no bearing. The cut is a straight slit. Only examination of the autopsy pictures, which the government prevented, with the Commission never doing it, never asking the doctors about them under oath, and denying analysts who can make sense ~~out~~ of them access to them, can disclose whether they have meaningful content on this point. It is more than possible that if proper pictures were taken of front and back, the character of each wound will be preserved as well as the relationship in size between the two, which is one of the key marks of distinction between entrance and exit wounds. The direction in which the

the flesh ends at the edge of the wounds also might be visible, which would, had they not been disturbed, reveal direction of the bullet.

CBS: Here, less than honestly, CBS acknowledges the public admission by Perry that the shot in the neck was from the front. It comes out this way: After a big buildup and exaggeration of the significance of the "turbulence" and "disorder", "Dr. Perry was rushed from the emergency room for a news conference, where he was badgered into giving a description of the wounds. The neck wound, he told the press, looked like an entry wound...In the transcript of that news conference, there's no doubt that Dr. Perry made it sound as if he had a firm opinion..." (page 9)

Fact: Here the true propagandist's subtle touch, the design to make it seem as though CBS is being forthright and is also giving the other side, both of which are untrue.

Dr. Perry was "rushed" nowhere. There was a considerable time lag between the official death of the President and his press conference. He was badgered into nothing, and there was no requirement or compulsion on him. The next day he ducked the press conference without difficulty. Now if the CBS intent were anything close to honest, it could have telecast that press conference. It could even have directly quoted the transcript. Its failure to do either tells the whole whitewash story. The truth is contrary to both CBS statements and innuendos. Without haste, without pressure, without badgering, the next day Dr. Perry told the autopsy doctors that the President's neck wound was of

Part 2, Page 13

front entrance. CBS knew this from my published work, which it read and had.

CBS: Mentions (page 9) the effort of Dr. Rose to guarantee a Texas autopsy, which it says it got from the Manchester book, mentioned with credit.

Fact: However, it earlier read this in WHITEWASH, which ~~earlier~~ pointed out, as CBS conceded, that "The Murder had been committed in that state, and there were no laws which gave the Federal government jurisdiction". This is not an important point, but it is one of many where, properly, credit should have gone to first-published sources. In each case, these are my books, and in every case, CBS either failed to mention them, or gave public credit for what I first did, to others -- or both.

CBS: "...FBI agents submitted a report later disclosed in Edward J. Epstein's book, 'Inquest', which said that they had heard one pathologist say he had found a wound in the President's back, could not find an exit" (page 9).

Fact: This information had, in paraphrase, been carefully leaked the end of 1963 and early 1964. However, if CBS were to give credit for "disclosure", the first book to "disclose" this was WHITEWASH, which prints facsimile excerpts of the FBI report on page 195. Further, this did not rest only on the FBI report, as my books also disclose, for it was in the testimony of Roy H. Kellerman, Secret Service agent in charge that day in Dallas and an observer of the autopsy.

CBS: "...Captain Humes...has re-examined the X-rays and photographs" (page 9).

Part 2, Page 14

Fact: This again is a deliberate CBS misstatement of fact, for it knew the truth from my writing. That is, that neither Humes nor any of the doctors saw the pictures--not at the time they took them, not as a preparation for and part of their testimony, not since then. The first and only time the doctors examined the pictures was when they were called to the Archives to do so in the end of 1966. CBS repeats this lie a number of times during the shows. It is not without point, for it has the effect of saying the doctors authenticate the picture, which they cannot do, and of disguising the fact that they did not have them for the completion of their autopsy report or as a necessary aid at their testimony. It also gave the impression that the doctors "re-examined" them for this show -- false -- as the press then reported.

CBS: Returned to Dr. Wecht and the autopsy sketch. When discussing this, Rather misrepresented fact, saying, "Now, the Commission Report accepted that the bullet entered very near the neck, did it now?" (page 10)

Fact: Basic to the Report is not that the rear, not-fatal wound was "very near the neck" but that it was in the neck and nowhere else.

CBS: Handles the discussion of the Boswell sketch, an autopsy body chart showing the rear non-fatal wound in the back, not the neck

Fact: (WHITEWASH 197), in a way to make it appear that when Wecht is ~~XXXXX~~ talking about Exhibit 385 he is talking about the Boswell sketch (page 10).

CBS Again repeated and compounded the lie about the "re-examination" of the pictures and X-rays. It also repeated its plug for itself, that this is the first appearance or interview granted by Dr. Humes. First Cronkite repeated the lie, "re-examined"

Part 2, Page 15

and then Rather said, just as falsely, "...Have you had a look at the pictures and X-rays from the time of the autopsy since the time that you submitted them to the Warren Commission?" (page 10).

Fact: Here the lie is more significant for it says what is false, that the Warren Commission had the pictures and X-rays, and that it is Humes, the chief witness on this aspect, who gave them to the Commission, the inference being in or prior to his sworn testimony.

In saying "yes", Humes also tells all the same lies; that he had earlier seen the pictures, which is false; that the Warren Commission, to his knowledge, had them, which is also false; and that he had them and gave them to the Commission, again false and again, to the knowledge of all involved, ~~knowingly~~ false. The choice is between 100% propaganda, and deliberate lies and some incompetence and ignorance by CBS. Humes' statements are only lies.

CBS Asked Humes to comment on the disparity between Exhibit 385 and the Boswell sketch. Of the Boswell sketch, Humes is permitted to say, without any question being asked, "they (meaning such sketches) are never meant to be accurate or precisely to scale" (page 11). Humes emphasized this absence of need for precision in response to the friendly question, designed for this purpose, "...in preparing autopsy reports" it is "routine" for them "at this stage" not "to be prepared precisely". "No precise measurements are made", he said, and the sketches are "used as an aide memorie, if you will, to the pathologist as he later writes his report" (page 10-11).

Fact: The autopsy is a medico-legal document. As a physician qualified

Part 2, Page 16

in forensic medicine, Dr. Humes knows, as certainly CBS did, that there is the utmost in precision required at every stage in an autopsy report on any murder, most particularly when it is the murder of a President. Further, it is the essence of the inexcusable argument made in pretended defense of the Boswell sketch that precise measurements had been made and correctly entered on this chart, where the location of the wound allegedly had been incorrectly marked but the description of the location allegedly correctly indicated with respect to its distance from the mastoid.

CBS: In further attempted self-justification, Humes says, "More importantly, we feel, that the measurements which are noted here at the margins of the drawing are the precise measurements which we took". (sic)

Fact: The notes, which are what Dr. Humes says these figures come from and the real basis of the autopsy, are totally missing. They are required to be in the Commission's File 371 and are not in duplicate files in the National Archives. They are required to be in Exhibit 397, and they are not. They have not been burned, as Mark Lane and others say, but were carefully preserved, as my books alone disclose. CBS knew all about this. If their intent was honesty and their purpose the fair exposition and presentation of both sides, at this point there should have been reference to the absence of these very notes Humes says are the most important, and to the absence of any exact sketches precisely locating all of the President's wounds, scars, etc., such as ^{those that} make the Oswald autopsy a model of scientific precision. Failure to ask these obvious and required

questions, already public in my writing (alone among the books) marks the CBS show as a whitewash. Here they had the man who prepared the suppressed ~~document~~ ^{Although} notes. ^{they} They are vital to authentication of what he is saying, ^{they} are missing, and CBS asked him no questions about it. This explains why Humes would appear on CBS but would not answer my letter or comment on the criticism of him and his autopsy in my books, because he knew he would be treated in this fashion. He will not dare face anyone who knows the fact and truth and is not partisan like C.B.S. Does he only "feel" these are the right measurements? Why did not CBS ask if he made any other charts or sketches?

CBS Permits Humes to "locate" the rear, non-fatal wound as he did in the autopsy report, in the abnormal fashion that "fixes" it by means of only flexible points, "fourteen centimeters from the tip of the right acromium and fourteen centimeters below the tip of the right mastoid". As I alone among the critics pointed out, each of these fails to locate, each is a variable. The ordinary and inflexible method is not to use the acromium, or shoulder joint, which involves the width of the body and means nothing, but to measure from the spine, which is fixed, regardless of the width of the body. Any measurement from it is precise and does not require knowledge of the width of the body. Using the mastoid, which is an entirely different part of the body, involves both the length of the neck and the position and angle of the head, neither of which are even remotely indicated in the autopsy. Here normal and accepted practice is for identification with the numbered vertebrae. Failure to do these things, to give inflexible points, puts the whole autopsy in question. CBS

Part 2, Page 18

failure to seek the truth about it and worse—flagrant whitewashing of it, with active contribution to that whitewashing,—raises questions about CBS integrity and end any possibility of serious belief of the CBS claim that it gave "both sides". Over and above all of this, there is the total absence in the autopsy report of any diagrams, an essential if the autopsy was to be understood and ^{to} stand on something other than faith, especially since the doctors knew that their report would not have the pictures and X-rays, which they immediately surrendered; didn't know if the pictures were clear; and because the pictures cannot show measurements, vital in any criminal proceeding. In fact, the absence of any charts is ample indication of further suppression or that the doctors had been told to prepare a general document that would not be closely scrutinized. It is a fair indication they had been ordered to whitewash, otherwise, with their forensic training and experience, they would have prepared a report that would be unequivocal and could have gone to court. Doctors with forensic-medical qualifications would not knowingly submit an autopsy report on which they could not face cross examination without prior assurance they would not have to. At the time this report was completed, Oswald had just been murdered. At the time it was drafted, he was still alive. At the time this draft was revised, he had just been murdered. There was the probability of cross examination by his lawyers. Here is a ~~next~~ likely reason for the burning of the first draft of the autopsy.

Further, this is an incomplete autopsy, which troubles CBS no more than the Commission. Both were silent about its incomplete-

ness. In short, this is no autopsy, ~~which~~ as the American Academy of Forensic Medicine declared at its annual convention.

CBS: Humes was asked if Exhibit 385, was "precise". He said it was because "we were trying to be precise, and refer back to our measurements, that we had made and noted in the margins of the other drawing" (page 11).

Fact: This is inconsistent with his testimony (WHITEWASH 183) and with the certifications executed, including by Admiral Galloway, Commanding Officer of the entire Naval Medical Installation. It is also inconsistent with the subsequent apologia, which are to the effect that these were just rough notes where accuracy was not essential. In his testimony, Humes swore that he then held in his hand "certain notes in longhand, or rather, copies of various notes in longhand made by myself, in part during the performance of the examination of the late President, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ 183), and in part after the examination..." (WHITEWASH 183) If we give Humes the benefit and assume that all those notes he made after the examination were the draft of the autopsy, which is not likely, there remains those today non-existent "longhand notes" that he swore were "made by myself...during the performance of the examination..." This, of course, is what would be required. All those details in the fifteen pages could not be in his head alone. To these he does not refer, and the reason is obvious: I have publicized the fact that they are not in Exhibit 397, where they were when he was on the stand, or in File 371, where they are also required to be. The notes of the autopsy are the essence of it. There are, officially, no notes to support this one, no notes against which it can be checked for error, and, of course,

no notes to be cross-examined about.

Complicating it even further, the receipts show that the Naval Hospital gave all its records of the autopsy, including every copy of it and these same notes, to the White House. So, unless the Commission gave him materials to work with, from his own testimony he had no basis for preparing the drawings. He also testified (WHITEWASH 181-2) that he gave verbal directions to the illustrator, ~~part~~ ⁱⁿ part from his memory, and that this method could not be precise. He begged for the photographs at several points in his testimony and said these charts, made months after the autopsy, could not be "true to scale". He also swore that with "the bony prominences...which we used as points of reference, I cannot transmit completely to the illustrator where they are situated." So much for CBS' and Humes' "precision."

CBS: About the head wound, Rather asked, "...there was only one?" Humes replied, "There was only one...That was posterior, about two and a half centimeters to the right of the midline, posteriorly." About this, he said, "we can" be "very precise" and "absolutely certain", "precisely and incontrovertibly" (page 12).

Fact: On what basis? There are no such markings on this, pretendedly the only chart -- a rough and inaccurate one never intended to be accurate, from his own telling. There is no head diagram of the fatal wound on which these markings appear. During Col. Pierre Finck's testimony about the head wound (2H379ff) he used "a scheme which I prepared before the 22nd of November. It is a teaching scheme". It was entered in evidence as Exhibit 400 (17H50). Part of Exhibit 397 is an unidentified

sketch which may be of the President's head wounds but it bears no marking of midline, no indication of 2½ cm and no marking that would locate this "entry" from top to bottom. In any event, Humes told Rather and the world-wide audience only that he had used only this single sketch in preparing the artist's conceptions. How "precise", "incontrovertibly" and "absolutely certain" he can be about describing to a third person how to locate a wound based on notes he couldn't have, from the testimony, and from a chart that he told CBS he used, when none of the data he needed is on his source, is something that CBS, for all the depth of its "investigation" did not ask the doctor. It does explain his reluctance to be interviewed by anyone other than CBS, however.

CBS: "How many autopsies have you performed?" Dr. Humes: "I would estimate approximately one thousand" (page 12).

Fact: None of these make any difference if these were autopsies of natural-causes deaths, stab wounds, blows by various objects, etc. The proper question, had CBS been intent upon anything but a whitewash, was how many autopsies where there of murder by gunshot. This CBS did not ask. Had he performed a million autopsies on cancer victims, this would not qualify him for the President autopsy, where the President was murdered with gunshots.

CBS: (Frankie said (page 13), to close the Humes appearance, "So, the chief pathologist at the Kennedy autopsy, after re-examining the X-rays and photographs...."

Fact: There is no limit to the number of times CBS was determined to repeat this lie. I emphasize the word "lie", for the alternative is perhaps less attractive. That CBS would even pretend to put

on such shows without knowing the simple, basic facts of the case is inconceivable. In the autopsy there is nothing more basic than the unquestionable fact that the undeveloped pictures left the hospital the early morning of November 23.

Comment: All of this has been a buildup for Arlen Specter, self-styled father of the "single-bullet theory". Cronkite's text is a biased recounting of what CBS wants believed. He repeated the Commission's accounting for three bullets through this theory, including the acknowledgment that "one missed entirely".

CBS: "Could one bullet have wounded both President Kennedy and Governor Connally?" (page 13)

Fact: This is another whitewashing question. What CBS should have asked is what the Report could not - and did not - face: could a bullet inflict these seven wounds and through this spectacular career remain almost 100% intact, almost 100% unutilized, and undeformed? To this all the doctors, in one way or another, said no, so Specter, as Commission questioner, substituted a hypothetical bullet which, like CBS, eliminated the essential qualifications about the real condition of the real bullet.

CBS: Specter said (page 14) that "the single most convincing piece of

Fact: evidence, that one bullet hit both men" was a question, not an answer: "where did the bullet go". His entire chain of reasoning is that this bullet came from the rear, of which he had no evidence. That was the conclusion, essential if Oswald were to be awarded singular guilt, not the evidence. He never considered that it could have come from the front, of which he then had abundant evidence. Had he ever considered front entry, he would have known that there was testimony of a bullet hitting the street

Part 2, Page ²³21

behind the President, such as that of Mrs. Donald Baker (WHITE-WASH II 129-31). It is only from the conclusion built into the Commission's work that the phoney question, equated with evidence by Specter, exists. It is not an answer. Specter is also consistent: he told nothing to the CBS audience about the condition of the real bullet and the medical testimony that it could not possibly have had the history he attributed to it. Nor did CBS ask.

CBS: Asked Specter to "describe for us any other theory, besides the single bullet theory, that would support the conclusions in the Report". S

Specter said "you could have three separate bullets...the President could have been struck at frame 186...the Governor could have been struck some 42 frames later (he meant not before 42 frames later) and the third shot could have hit President Kennedy's head at frame 313...So it is not indispensable to have the single bullet conclusion to come to the basic finding that Oswald was the sole assassin." (page 14).

Fact: This is quite true, if you present such a specious argument to CBS. It is not otherwise true. Aside from all the many other things disqualifying it, and they are, indeed, many, there is the question of the blood of James C. Tague. He was struck by a fragment of a "missed" bullet or the spray of concrete from it where it struck the curbstone. The Commission and CBS both acknowledge elsewhere this "missed" bullet. Cronkite, on the page before, said the Commission concluded "one missed entirely". CBS and Specter have nothing more to say about this "missed" bullet. To make their whitewash work, Tague bled in vain. They

have cast him out of history.

Comment: Having pulled this off without any CBS-man or the former Commission counsel getting ill on camera. CBS rapidly switched to the story of this bullet (page 15) and its finding.

Rather leads Darrell Tomlinson, the hospital engineer, through a tortured editing of his sworn testimony (he told Specter he'd have trouble sleeping if he testified to what Specter wanted him to) in which just about everything was as CBS wanted. Even this: RATHER: "It was a spent shell?" TOMLINSON: "Yes". Now there was no shell at all.

This is followed by continuing CBS misrepresentation: "Critics have claimed that in fact the bullet came from the President's stretcher..." CBS has special critics in its files for such quote, critics not as generally understood by the word. I would be more precise to say the major critics believe the history of this bullet is consistent with its having been planted, an obvious possibility/^{publicly}considered by neither the Commission nor CBS (page 16).

CBS: Belatedly, but with what a build-up, CBS asked if this bullet could have remained in such close-to-pristine condition with the career attributed to it. They conducted their own test, selecting as its head the man who conducted the original one and thus had his own past and record to justify. Cronkite's cute representation of the test was "to see how far a 6.5 Mannlicher-Carcano bullet would penetrate" (page 16).

Fact: The kind of bullet is also important. Was it of the ancient and undependable vintage allegedly used in the assassination or one of the fresh ones, of which I have a sample, made not more than

twenty years ago but currently. The representation of the Governor's chest wound was entirely lacking in anything even pretended to duplicate the bone, four inches of which was so smashed its pieces acted as secondary projectiles, or in anything that would take fragments of metal from this bullet, as happened in the Governor's chest. There was masonite for the bone in the wrist alone (page 16).

So transparent is this fake, participated in by Walter Lister (who then wrote in the "New Republic" dated August 19, 1967, that those who feel other than he does are dishonest) that Dr. Olivier, without protest or comment from Lister or CBS, on his own declared (page 17), "Of course, we have no rib here, but it still simulates passing through the flesh."

Further destroying what little pretense of integrity existed in this charade with a Presidential assassination, Olivier then acknowledged that his test bullet, in some cases, "lodged in the wrist." Thus there would be a wrist wound that did not transit the wrist, as happened with Connally, and no accounting for his thigh wound, where there was enough power behind the bullet to lodge a fragment in the bone that the doctors did not remove. What does this test - even without the added barrier of the Governor's rib, which CBS omitted, show about the thigh wound? Olivier said, "Behind the wrist, we had another gelatin block, representing the Governor's thigh. In none of the cases did this thing actually penetrate that!" He has a consolation prize for CBS: "but it would have taken very little more velocity to have caused a similar wound." In short, they couldn't make it work - not in any case, not with a crooked test, which had no

representation of the rib. Not a single "thing" (a happy choice!) actually penetrated" the mockup of the thigh! Neither Lister nor Olivier are troubled by his conclusions: "I think they very strongly show that this one bullet could have caused all the wounds". Cronkite took it up for CBS: "Our tests confirm that a single bullet could indeed have wounded both men." What is the proof? CBS couldn't do it even when they rigged a crooked test!

CBS: Generously, since they control the semantics, CBS concedes that it is "possible" but asks "if it is probable" (page 17).

Fact: It asked (according to the transcript) Dr. William F. Rhos of Northern Virginia Doctors Hospital if "the minute a bullet hits a bone it shatters that bullet". The question is not this at all but whether a bullet hitting bones in not less than three different body parts and shedding fragments in all three can remain intact, unutilated and undeformed. When he confronted a direct question by Rather, could this bullet have had the history the Commission and CBS attributed to it, the doctor said, "I would say it is highly improbable," which he repeated for additional emphasis (page 18).

CBS: Cronkite promoted Governor Connally to "the most persuasive critic of the single bullet theory", a strange position for a man who strongly endorses the Report, who has specifically said he has made no study, and not read the criticisms that have been published, but CBS saw to it, then and since, that their word would be law. He is a "critic" to CBS' liking because "he accepts the Warren Report's conclusion, that Oswald did all the shooting." (page 18). If this is a "critic" to CBS, can anything it says be trusted or believed? The kind of "critic" Connally is becomes

more transparent when CBS had him promote his wife to "the best witness I know". What does she believe? ~~Thaxkixixxfixixixix~~
Exactly what CBS is going to conclude, exactly what it let Specter get away with palming off, that there was no "missed " bullet and the first and third bullets hit the President and the second Connally. How can CBS lose? Mrs. Connally dutifully appeared on camera to say just this. Unfortunately, CBS, with only four hours, did not have time to ask her what she told LIFE, that she could not get any federal investigators interested in taking the Governor garments until after they were cleaned, which, in turn, destroyed any evidence on them or evidentiary value in such things as the direction of the shots and the kind of ammunition used (pages 18-9).

CBS: There is public agony: "on the evidence (meaning on what CBS

Fact: chooses to say and what it calls evidence and pretends is all the evidence, which is 100% false) it is difficult to believe the single bullet theory. But, to believe the other theories is even more difficult". The viewer has no choice but to agree, for CBS presented n other "theory" of any "critic" for his consideration. It does pretend to consider "a second assassin" but discards this on the fanciful ground that "his bullet travels miraculously a trajectory identical with Oswald's". From this the viewer is to believe that there is such a thing as an established trajectory back from the bodies, which is 100% false. All the doctors, who were wrong in this also, ever could be enticed into saying of these "trajectories" is that the bullets originated "above and behind". Since it sets up its own straw men, CBS does not have to knock them down. It builds them so they cannot stand, which is more foolproof.

CBS: "There is not a single item of hard evidence for a second ~~Rxxxx~~ assassin" (page 20).

Fact: There is no "hard evidence" of any other kind. CBS sought none any more than the Commission did. Nonetheless, its own fake tests and its one phoney reconstruction still proved that it was impossible for the best marksmen they could get, under greatly improved circumstance, to have committed the assassination. More, it also proved this rifle was incapable of it except under the greatest possible stroke of luck - luck that didn't come to its own replicated "tests".

With no one to gainsay him, no child to cry "naked", Cronkite, without problems with his own ignorance, for he is reading someone else's copy, can keep a straight face and silent conscience when he said, "The Governor's objections, which were the most troubling of all, now disappear." How convenient of CBS, to present no one else's "objections", which certainly makes the Governor's "the most troubling". And who was there to argue with CBS, which then said, on the basis of nothing but its own strong desire, that the straw man it built incapable of standing was demolished: These "now disappear". R.I.P. After "disappear", with no additional intrusions upon the solemnity, dignity and overpowering logic of this Grimm tale, Cronkite intoned: "CBS NEWS concludes, therefore, that Oswald was the sole assassin" (page 20).

CBS: Knowing full well that it cannot stop here, CBS asks rhetorical questions, the answers to which it had firmly fixed in its corporate mind and glowing tube before it undertook its video whitewash: "But was he truly alone".

Fact: There need be no suspense. There is less doubt about the answer to

this CBS question than there is about their daytime questions in what it then honestly described as "soap operas".